

LAP6 Rec'd PCT/PTO 27 MAR 2006**Re Box No. V**

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents in the present opinion:

D1: EP 0 585 186 A (EASTMAN KODAK CO) March 2, 1994 (1994-03-02)
D2: US 4 024 397 A (WEINER SEYMOUR L) May 17, 1977 (1997-05-17)
D3: US 5 912 504 A (YAMASHITA HIROMICHI ET AL) June 15, 1999 (1999-06-15)
D4: WO 00/38249 A (CORUM CURTIS A; INTEL CORP (US); LI ZONG FU (US)) June 29, 2000 (2000-06-29)

- 2 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 10 is not novel according to Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 (see Abstract, Figs. 2, 4, Column 8, Lines 35-43) discloses all the features of these claims, see circuit support (12), semiconductor element (14), lens unit (20), supporting area (26).

Also documents D2-D4 disclose at least the subject matter of claim 1.

- 3 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the subject matter of claims 3-5, 8 and 9 is not based on an inventive step according to Article 33(3) PCT, since the additional features are obvious.

Re Box No. VII

- 4 Contradictory to the requirements of Rule 5.1 a) ii) PCT neither the relevant prior art disclosed in documents D2-D4 nor the documents themselves are specified in the description.

Re Box No. VIII

- 5. The application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 6 PCT because claims 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9 are not clear.
- 5.1 The difference between the features "integral component" of claim 1 and "in one piece" of claim 2 is unclear.
- 5.2 Subject matter claims 3, 6 and 8 are defined by methods, for which reason the claim category is unclear.
- 5.3 The expression "unwanted optical effects" used in claim 9 is unclear.